



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/042,955	01/08/2002	Brent Anderson	113937-002	4496
24573	7590	05/20/2004	EXAMINER	
BELL, BOYD & LLOYD, LLC PO BOX 1135 CHICAGO, IL 60690-1135			PIAZZA CORCORAN, GLADYS JOSEFINA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1733	

DATE MAILED: 05/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/042,955	ANDERSON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Gladys J Piazza Corcoran	1733	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on February 9, 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 and 32-60 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 and 32-60 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. <u>5/17/04</u> . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

FINAL ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. As indicated in the prior Office action, the information disclosure statement filed August 26, 2003 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(3) because it does not include a concise explanation of the relevance, as it is presently understood by the individual designated in 37 CFR 1.56(c) most knowledgeable about the content of the information, of each patent listed that is not in the English language (references FR 724974, CH 247934, FR 1074166, DE 1761403, DE 2332927). It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 2, 9, 4, 14, 15, 27-29, 33, 48-50, 56, 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

4. Claim 2 recites the limitation "the first sheet" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is suggested to amend to --the first non-molten sheet--.

5. Claim 4 is unclear by reciting that the second polymeric material is a multiple layer structure while being dependent upon claim 3 which recites that the second polymeric material is a monolayer structure. It is suggested to amend the dependency

Art Unit: 1733

of claim 4 to claim 2. (As set forth in paragraph 4 of the prior Office action filed December 1, 2003).

6. Claim 9 recites the limitation "the second sheet" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is suggested to amend to --the second non-molten sheet--.

7. Claims 14 and 15 are unclear by reciting that the polymeric material is a second polyolefin, however there is never a first polyolefin. (As set forth in paragraph 5 of the prior Office action filed December 1, 2003).

8. Claim 27 recites the limitation "the first sheet" in line 13. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is suggested to amend to --the first non-molten sheet--.

9. Claim 28 recites the limitation "the second sheet" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is suggested to amend to --the second non-molten sheet--.

10. Claim 29 recites the limitation "the second sheet" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is suggested to amend to --the second non-molten sheet--.

11. Claim 33 recites the limitation "the first sheet" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is suggested to amend to --the first non-molten sheet--.

Art Unit: 1733

12. Claim 48 recites the limitation "the first sheet" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is suggested to amend to --the first non-molten sheet--.

13. Claim 49 recites the limitation "the first sheet" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is suggested to amend to --the first non-molten sheet--.

14. Claim 50 recites the limitation "the first sheet" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is suggested to amend to --the first non-molten sheet--.

15. Claim 56 recites the limitation "the second sheet" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is suggested to amend to --the second non-molten sheet--.

16. Claim 57 recites the limitation "the second sheet" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is suggested to amend to --the second non-molten sheet--.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

17. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

18. Claims 1-3, 9, 13, 16, 17-23, 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Karfiol et al. (US Patent No. 2,477,300).

Karfiol discloses a method for treating a surface of a layered polymeric structure by providing a first non-molten sheet of material (facing web 9), providing a second non-molten sheet of material (backing web 1), positioning the first non-molten sheet or the second non-molten sheet to overlap at least a portion of the other sheet to define an interference zone, directing a first molten polymeric material (plastic layer 7) into the interference zone to adhere the first non-molten sheet to the second non-molten sheet to form the layered structure and texturing an outer surface of the first non-molten sheet or the second non-molten sheet to form a pattern on the outer surface (column 2, lines 20-38).

As to claims 2, the first sheet (facing web 9) is a second polymeric material. As to claim 3, the second polymeric material is a monolayer structure. As to claim 9, the second sheet is a third polymeric material or paper (backing web 1). As to claim 13, the step of directing a first polymeric material comprises the step of extruding a molten polymeric material (column 2, lines 9-13). As to claim 16, the step of texturing is carried out essentially immediately after the step of adhering the first sheet to the second sheet. As to claim 17, the step of texturing comprises the step of contacting the first or second sheet with a surface having a pattern (rolls 11 and 4). As to claim 18, the surface is provided on a roll. As to claim 20, the roll is a back-up roll. As to claim 21, the pattern is carried on two rolls (rolls 4 and 11). As to claims 22 and 23 the pattern extends outward and inward from the surface of the roll (column 3, lines 35-48). As to claim 26, the pattern comprises a plurality of spaced objects (grooves).

Art Unit: 1733

19. Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 9, 13-20, 22-24, 27, 28, 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Brinley (US Patent No. 5,232,535).

Brinley discloses a method for treating a surface of a layered polymeric structure by providing a first non-molten sheet of material (polymeric film 5), providing a second non-molten sheet of material (web 1), positioning the first non-molten sheet or the second non-molten sheet to overlap at least a portion of the other sheet to define an interference zone (the sheets are laminated to each other), directing a first molten polymeric material into the interference zone to adhere the first non-molten sheet to the second non-molten sheet to form the layered structure (melted resin from extruder and die 8 is deposited on the web 1 and adhered to film 5), and texturing an outer surface of the first non-molten sheet or the second non-molten sheet to form a pattern on the outer surface (engraved chill roll 7 imparts an impression of the engraved pattern onto the exposed surface of the polymeric film 5) (column 2, lines 31-53).

As to claim 2, the first sheet is a second polymeric material (polymeric film 5). As to claim 3, the second polymeric material is a monolayer (polymeric film 5). As to claim 5, Brinley discloses the polymeric material as claimed (column 2, line 67 to column 3, line 14). As to claim 6, Brinley discloses using homopolymers or copolymers (column 2, line 67 to column 3, line 14). As to claim 9, Brinley discloses the second sheet is paper (web 1 of paper; column 2, lines 53-66). As to claim 13, the step of directing a first polymeric material comprises the step of extruding a molten polymeric material (column 2, lines 38-40). As to claim 14, Brinley discloses that the molten polymeric material is a polyolefin (column 2, lines 15-18). As to claim 15, Brinley discloses that the molten

Art Unit: 1733

polymeric material is a homopolymer of ethylene (column 2, lines 15-18). As to claim 16, the step of texturing is carried out substantially simultaneously with the step of joining the first sheet to the second sheet (column 2, lines 40-46). As to claim 17, the step of texturing comprises the step of contacting the first sheet or the second sheet with a surface having a pattern (engraved chill roll 7). As to claim 18, the surface is provided on a roll (engraved chill roll 7). As to claim 19, the roll is a chill roll. As to claim 20, the roll is considered to be a back-up roll. As to claims 22 and 23, the pattern is etched on the surface of the roll, therefore the etched portions are considered to extend inward from the surface of the roll and the un-etched portions are considered to extend outward from the surface of the roll. As to claim 24, the roll is metal (chrome plated; column 3, line 46). As to claim 27, all the limitations are met as discussed above in reference to claims 1, 2, and 5. As to claim 28, Brinley discloses the second sheet is paper (web 1 of paper; column 2, lines 53-66). As to claim 32, the step of directing a second polymeric material into the interference zone comprises the step of applying an adhesive material (the molten polymeric material is considered to be adhesive).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

20. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

21. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

Art Unit: 1733

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

22. Claims 4, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karfiol et al. (US Patent No. 2,477,300), as applied to claims 3 and 18 above, and further in view of conventional practice.

As to claims 24 and 25, the reference Karfiol does not specifically disclose the particular materials the embossing rolls are formed of, however it is well known and considered conventional in the art to form embossing rolls of metal, rubber, cork or plastic. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to form the materials as shown by Karfiol with embossing rolls formed of conventional materials as is well known in the art and well within the purview of one of ordinary skill in the art. It is noted that Applicant has not traversed this statement, therefore it is considered acquiesced by Applicant as admitted prior art.

As to claim 4, it is well known in the art to provide base layers for decorative materials out of multiple layers. It would have been well within the purview of one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the base layer in Karfiol as a multiple layer structure as considered well known in the art. Only the expected results would be attained.

Art Unit: 1733

23. Claims 5-12, 14-16, 27-30, 32-34, 36-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karfiol et al. (US Patent No. 2,477,300) in view of conventional practices as exemplified by Aizawa (US Patent No. 5,928,762).

As to claims 5-8, 10-12, 14, 15, 27, 29 Karfiol does not disclose the particular polymeric material used for the layers, only suggesting that any known thermoplastic or thermosetting material may be used. It is well known in the art to provide the claimed polymeric material for film layers in decorative materials. Additionally, Aizawa discloses a decorative material formed of the claimed materials (column 2, lines 54-65; column 5, line 42 to column 6, line 5). As to claim 6, the polyolefins in Aizawa are selected from homopolymers and copolymers. As to claim 7, Aizawa discloses wherein the copolymers are selected from copolymers of ethylene and α -olefins having from 3 to 20 carbons (column 2, lines 54-65). As to claim 8, it would have been obvious to provide the decorative sheet of multiple layers of the well known materials as further exemplified by Aizawa, only the expected results would be attained. It is noted that Applicant has not asserted any criticality to the particular layer and these combinations are known in the art. As to claim 14, Aizawa discloses the molten polymeric material is a second polyolefin (column 12, lines 25-30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the polymeric layers in Karfiol with well known conventional materials for decorative material laminates as exemplified by Aizawa, only the expected results would be attained.

As to claims 9-12 and 28, Karfiol discloses the base layer can be of a paper or plastic or other opaque material. It is well known in the art to provide bases for

Art Unit: 1733

decorative materials out of metal. For example in Aizawa, the second sheet is selected from the group consisting of a third polymeric material, paper, and metal (column 5, lines 30-39). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the base layer in Karfiol with well known alternative materials such metal as exemplified by Aizawa. As to claims 10 and 29, Aizawa discloses the claimed materials (column 5, line 43 to column 6, line 5). As to claims 11 and 12, Aizawa discloses providing the base material out of a polyamide (column 5, line 45). As to the particular type of polyamide, nylon 6,6, nylon 6, and nylon 6,12 are considered to be the most common and available polyamides, therefore it would have been well with in the purview of one of ordinary skill in the art to provide such well known materials. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the base material in the method as shown by Karfiol with conventional materials such as metal, as exemplified by Aizawa. Only the expected results would be attained.

As to claims 16 and 30, Karfiol discloses a method of embossing decorative material where the embossing step appears to be carried out immediately after the laminating step. However, it is well known in the art to provide embossing to decorative materials by either embossing prior to laminating or simultaneously embossing the material and laminating the material in order to reduce excess steps and conserve heating. For example, Aizawa discloses simultaneous laminating and embossing to reduce the loss of energy (column 7, lines 35-47; column 13, lines 60-64). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the method of forming the packaging material as shown by Karfiol by

Art Unit: 1733

simultaneously carrying out the embossing and laminating steps as is known in the art and exemplified by Aizawa in order to reduce steps and conserve heating.

As to claim 32, the polymeric material 7 in Karfiol is considered to be an adhesive material. As to claim 33, the step of texturing comprises the step of contacting the first or second sheet with a surface having a pattern (rolls 11 and 4). As to claim 34, the surface is provided on a roll. As to claim 36, the roll is a back-up roll. As to claim 37, the pattern is carried on two rolls (rolls 4 and 11). As to claims 38 and 39 the pattern extends outward and inward from the surface of the roll (column 3, lines 35-48). As to claims 40-47, it would have been well within the purview of one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a variety of decorative designs such as those claimed on the decorative material. These are considered within the conventional choices for such materials and only the expected results would have been attained by selecting such designs. As to claims 48, 49, 56 the first and second sheets in Karfiol are monolayers. As to claims 48, 50 and 56, it is well known in the art to provide sheet layers for decorative materials out of multiple layers. It would have been well within the purview of one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the sheet layer in Karfiol of a multiple layer structure as considered well known in the art. Only the expected results would be attained. As to claims 51-55, it would have been obvious to provide the decorative sheet of multiple layers of the well known materials as further exemplified by Aizawa, only the expected results would be attained. It is noted that Applicant has not asserted any criticality to the particular layer and these combinations are known in the art. As to claims 57-60, as discussed above, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art at the time of the invention to provide known and conventional materials for the polymeric layers in Karfiol as further exemplified by Aizawa.

24. Claims 4, 8, 48, 50-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karfiol et al. (US Patent No. 2,477,300) (optionally in view of Aizawa (US Patent No. 5,928,762)) as set forth above and further in view of Araki (EP 1153974).

As to claims 4, 8, 48, 50 and 56, it is well known in the art to provide sheet layers for decorative materials out of multiple layers. It would have been well within the purview of one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the sheet layer in Karfiol of a multiple layer structure as considered well known in the art. Only the expected results would be attained. As to claims 8, 51-55, it would have been obvious to provide the decorative sheet of multiple layers of the well known materials as further exemplified by Aizawa, only the expected results would be attained. It is noted that Applicant has not asserted any criticality to the particular layer and these combinations are known in the art. As to claims 57-60, as discussed above, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide known and conventional materials for the polymeric layers in Karfiol as further exemplified by Aizawa. Furthermore, it is exemplified by Araki that it is known to provide the sheet layers in decorative materials out of multiple layer structures, including layers of ethylene vinyl alcohol copolymer, PVDC, and copolymers of ethylene and α olefin copolymers ([0003], [0004], pages 3-4, page 9, page 17). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the method of forming a decorative material as shown in

Art Unit: 1733

Karfiol with multiple layer sheets as is considered well known in the art of conventionally known materials as exemplified by Aizawa and further exemplified by Araki.

25. Claims 4, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brinley (US Patent No. 5,232,535) (optionally in view of Karfiol- see rejection below), as applied to claims 3 and 18 above, and further in view of conventional practice.

As to claims 24 and 25, the reference Brinley does not specifically disclose the particular materials the embossing rolls are formed of (other than mentioning that the roll may be chrome plated), however it is well known and considered conventional in the art to form embossing rolls of metal, rubber, cork or plastic. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to form the materials as shown by Brinley with embossing rolls formed of conventional materials as is well known in the art and well within the purview of one of ordinary skill in the art. It is noted that Applicant has not traversed this statement, therefore it is considered acquiesced by Applicant as admitted prior art.

As to claim 4, it is well known in the art to provide base layers for decorative materials out of multiple layers. It would have been well within the purview of one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the base layer in Brinley as a multiple layer structure as considered well known in the art. Only the expected results would be attained.

26. Claims 5-12, 14-15, 26-30, 32-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brinley (US Patent No. 5,232,535) in view of conventional practices as exemplified by Aizawa (US Patent No. 5,928,762).

Art Unit: 1733

Brinley discloses that suitable materials for the polymeric layer may be used, however the list is not limited (column 2, line 66 to column 3, line 14). It is well known in the art to provide the claimed polymeric material for film layers in decorative materials. Additionally, Aizawa discloses a decorative material formed of the claimed materials (column 2, lines 54-65; column 5, line 42 to column 6, line 5). As to claim 6, the polyolefins in Aizawa are selected from homopolymers and copolymers. As to claim 7, Aizawa discloses wherein the copolymers are selected from copolymers of ethylene and α -olefins having from 3 to 20 carbons (column 2, lines 54-65). As to claim 8, it would have been obvious to provide the decorative sheet of multiple layers of the well known materials as further exemplified by Aizawa, only the expected results would be attained. It is noted that Applicant has not asserted any criticality to the particular layer and these combinations are known in the art. As to claim 14, Aizawa discloses the molten polymeric material is a second polyolefin (column 12, lines 25-30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the polymeric layers in Karfiol with well known conventional materials for decorative material laminates as exemplified by Aizawa, only the expected results would be attained.

As to claims 9-12, 28, Brinley discloses a paper base layer. However, it is well known in the art to provide bases for decorative materials out of a variety of materials including paper, polymeric material or metal. For example in Aizawa, the second sheet is selected from the group consisting of a third polymeric material, paper, and metal (column 5, lines 30-39). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

Art Unit: 1733

the time of the invention to provide the base layer in Brinley with well known alternative materials such as polymeric material or metal as exemplified by Aizawa. As to claims 10 and 29, Aizawa discloses the claimed materials (column 5, line 43 to column 6, line 5). As to claims 11 and 12, Aizawa discloses providing the base material out of a polyamide (column 5, line 45). As to the particular type of polyamide, nylon 6,6, nylon 6, and nylon 6,12 are considered to be the most common and available polyamides, therefore it would have been well within the purview of one of ordinary skill in the art to provide such well known materials. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the base material in the method as shown by Brinley with conventional materials such as polymeric materials or metal, as exemplified by Aizawa. Only the expected results would be attained.

As to claim 30, Brinley discloses a method of embossing decorative material where the embossing step appears to be carried out simultaneously to the adhering of the first to the second sheet. As to claim 32, the polymeric materials in Brinley are considered to be an adhesive material. As to claim 33, the step of texturing comprises the step of contacting the first sheet with a surface having a pattern (engraved chill roll 7). As to claim 34, the surface is provided on a roll (engraved chill roll 7). As to claim 35, the roll is a chill roll. As to claim 36, the roll is considered to be a back-up roll. As to claims 38 and 39, the pattern is etched on the surface of the roll, therefore the etched portions are considered to extend inward from the surface of the roll and the un-etched portions are considered to extend outward from the surface of the roll. As to claims 26 and 40-47, it would have been well within the purview of one of ordinary skill in the art at

Art Unit: 1733

the time of the invention to provide a variety of decorative designs such as those claimed on the decorative material. These are considered within the conventional choices for such materials and only the expected results would have been attained by selecting such designs. As to claims 48, 49, 56, the first and second sheets in Brinley are monolayers.

As to claims 48, 50 and 56, it is well known in the art to provide sheet layers for decorative materials out of multiple layers. It would have been well within the purview of one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the sheet layer in Brinley of a multiple layer structure as considered well known in the art. Only the expected results would be attained. As to claims 51-55, it would have been obvious to provide the decorative sheet of multiple layers of the well known materials as further exemplified by Aizawa, only the expected results would be attained. It is noted that Applicant has not asserted any criticality to the particular layer and these combinations are known in the art.

As to claim 57, as discussed above it is known to provide polymeric materials such as a polyamide or a polyester as an alternative to paper in decorative laminates as shown by Aizawa. As to claims 58 and 60, Brinley discloses that the second polymeric material (melted resin 9) is a polyolefin or a homopolymer of polyethylene. As to claim 59, as discussed above, it is known to provide the claimed materials for layers of decorative laminates as shown by Aizawa.

27. Claims 9, 16-24, 28, 36-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brinley (US Patent No. 5,232,535) as set forth above and further in view of Karfiol (US Patent No. 2,477,300).

Art Unit: 1733

As to claims 9 and 28, Brinley discloses a paper base layer. However, it is well known in the art to provide bases for decorative materials out of a variety of materials including paper or polymeric material. For example, Karfiol discloses forming a base layer of a decorative material out of paper or alternatively a polymeric material (column 1, lines 5-15). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the base layer in Brinley with well known alternative materials such as polymeric material as exemplified by Karfiol.

As to claim 16, Brinley discloses carrying out the step of texturing substantially simultaneously with the step of adhering the sheets. However, it is well known in the art to alternatively laminate the layers prior to bonding. For example, Karfiol discloses forming decorative materials by laminating the layers first and then embossing. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the method of forming the decorative material in Brinley by laminating the layers prior to embossing as a well known alternative in the art and further exemplified by Karfiol.

As to claim 17, Brinley discloses the step of texturing comprises the step of contacting the first sheet or the second sheet with a surface having a pattern (engraved chill roll 7). As to claim 18, Brinley discloses the surface is provided on a roll (engraved chill roll 7). As to claim 19, Brinley discloses the roll is a chill roll. As to claim 20, Brinley discloses the roll is considered to be a back-up roll.

As to claims 20, 21, 36 and 37, it is known in the art of forming decorative material to provide texture on both sides of the laminate in order to provide the

Art Unit: 1733

decorative effect on the both sides. For example Karfiol discloses forming texture on both sides of a decorative material by providing a pattern on two rolls forming a nip where each roll is considered a back up roll. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the method of forming a decorative laminate as shown by Brinley with two rolls having a pattern in order to provide texture on both sides of the laminate as shown by Karfiol.

As to claims 22, 23, 38, 39 Brinley discloses the pattern is etched on the surface of the roll, therefore the etched portions are considered to extend inward from the surface of the roll and the un-etched portions are considered to extend outward from the surface of the roll. Furthermore, Karfiol discloses it is known in the art of providing a texture on decorative laminates to provide embossing rolls with the pattern extending either inward or outward from the roll (column 3, lines 35-47). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the method of forming decorative laminates as shown by Brinley with a pattern roll that has a pattern that either extends inward or outward from the roll as is considered known in the art and further exemplified by Karfiol. As to claim 24, Brinley discloses the roll is metal (chrome plated; column 3, line 46).

As to claim 27, Brinley discloses all the limitations are met as discussed above in reference to claims 1, 2, and 5. As to claim 28, Brinley discloses the second sheet is paper (web 1 of paper; column 2, lines 53-66). As to claim 32, Brinley discloses the step of directing a second polymeric material into the interference zone comprises the

Art Unit: 1733

step of applying an adhesive material (the molten polymeric material is considered to be adhesive).

28. Claims 4, 8, 48, 50-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brinley (US Patent No. 5,232,535) (optionally in view of Aizawa (US Patent No. 5,928,762)) as set forth above and further in view of Araki (EP 1153974).

As to claims 4, 8, 48, 50 and 56, it is well known in the art to provide sheet layers for decorative materials out of multiple layers. It would have been well within the purview of one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the sheet layer in Brinley of a multiple layer structure as considered well known in the art. Only the expected results would be attained. As to claims 8, 51-55, it would have been obvious to provide the decorative sheet of multiple layers of the well known materials as further exemplified by Aizawa, only the expected results would be attained. It is noted that Applicant has not asserted any criticality to the particular layer and these combinations are known in the art. As to claims 57-60, as discussed above, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide known and conventional materials for the polymeric layers in Brinley as further exemplified by Aizawa. As to claim 57, as discussed above it is known to provide polymeric materials such as a polyamide or a polyester as an alternative to paper in decorative laminates as shown by Aizawa. As to claims 58 and 60, Brinley discloses that the second polymeric material (melted resin 9) is a polyolefin or a homopolymer of polyethylene. As to claim 59, as discussed above, it is known to provide the claimed materials for layers of decorative laminates as shown by Aizawa. Furthermore, it is exemplified by Araki that it is known

Art Unit: 1733

to provide the sheet layers in decorative materials out of multiple layer structures, including layers of ethylene vinyl alcohol copolymer, PVDC, and copolymers of ethylene and α olefin copolymers ([0003], [0004], pages 3-4, page 9, page 17). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the method of forming a decorative material as shown in Brinley with multiple layer sheets as is considered well known in the art of conventionally known materials as exemplified by Aizawa and further exemplified by Araki.

Response to Arguments

29. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection as required by Applicant's amendments to the claims.

Conclusion

30. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of


Art Unit: 1733

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gladys J Piazza Corcoran whose telephone number is (571) 272-1214. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8am-5:30pm (alternate Fridays off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Crispino can be reached on (571) 272-1226. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Gladys J. Corcoran
Examiner
Art Unit 1733

GJPC